

REMARKS

By the above actions, the specification, abstract and claims 1-3 and 5-7 have been amended. In view of these actions and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is requested.

The Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter with respect to claim 3, 4, and 6-8 is acknowledged with appreciation. Accordingly, while claims 6-8 remain dependent from claim 1, claim 3 has been rewritten in allowable independent form, so that claims 3-5 (claim 5 having been amended to depend from claim 3) should now be in condition for allowance and formal indication of this fact is requested.

With regard to the objection to the drawings, the express reference to the drive being on the middle roof part has been deleted and a more generic description used instead. This generic description is supported by the illustration of drive 18 on the front roof part in Fig. 1 and by the original disclosure that the drive could be on the middle roof part. Thus, withdrawal of the objection the drawings is now requested.

The changes to the abstract, specification and claims proposed by the Examiner have been adopted so that the objection the abstract, specification and claims should now be withdrawn.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. However, with the revisions to claims 1 & 2, the relationship between the parts of these two claims should now be clear and definite so that withdrawal of this reject is in order and is hereby requested.

1, 2, 5, & 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by the Guillez et al. patent. However, in view of the amendments to claim 1, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

In particular, amended claim 1 sets forth that:

one of the closing units has a bearing part which is attached to one of the first and second roof parts, the bearing part having a centering journal which is adapted to engage a centering sleeve which is attached to a bearing part on the other of the first and second roof parts so as to produce, when the roof closes, a centering engagement from when the first and second roof parts come into proximity with one another until they border each other and locking elements of the locking device engage.

A centering arrangement of the type disclosed and claimed here, in which a bearing journal,

e.g., 27, 38 engages a bearing sleeve, e.g., 33, 39, starting at a point when the roof parts come into "into proximity with one another" (see, Figs 4 & 5) "until they border each other and locking elements of the locking device engage" as shown in Figs. 2 & 8, has no counterpart in the Guillez et al. patent. The rod 16 which the Examiner considered to function as a centering means does not and cannot serve a centering function and it is merely the transmission means by which the rotation of drive motor is transferred to the latch mechanisms. Moreover, it most certainly does not anticipate or even remotely suggest the centering arrangement as recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn and such action is requested.

The prior art that has been cited, but not applied by the Examiner has been taken into consideration during formulation of this response. However, since this art was not considered by the Examiner to be of sufficient relevance to apply against any of the claims, no detailed comments thereon are believed to be warranted at this time.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise, which could be eliminated through discussions with applicant's representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that the further prosecution of this application can thereby be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,



David S. Safran
Registration No. 27,997

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900
401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004-2128

(703) 827-8094

DSS:kmm

W679134.1